

**TRANSCRIBED FROM DIGITAL RECORDING**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION

SUSAN NEDZA, ex rel,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

AIM SPECIALTY HEALTH, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 15 CV 6937

Chicago, Illinois  
October 21, 2020  
10:59 a.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE SUSAN E. COX, MAGISTRATE JUDGE

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs:

MR. MATTHEW J. PIERS  
MR. CHARLES DAVID WYSONG  
MS. EMILY REES BROWN  
Hughes Socol Piers Resnick & Dym, Ltd.  
70 West Madison Street, Suite 4000  
Chicago, IL 60602  
(312) 580-0100

MR. SAMUEL EMERSON BROWN  
Phillips and Cohen LLP  
2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 833-4567

**\*\*PLEASE NOTIFY OF INCORRECT SPEAKER IDENTIFICATION\*\***  
**NOTE: USE OF A SPEAKERPHONE MAY MAKE PORTIONS**  
**UNINTELLIGIBLE AND INAUDIBLE**

Transcriber:

KATHLEEN M. FENNELL, CSR, RPR, RMR, FCRR  
Official Court Reporter  
United States District Court  
219 South Dearborn Street, Suite 1426  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
Telephone: (312) 435-5569  
Kathleen\_Fennell@ilnd.uscourts.gov

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 For the Defendants: MS. LISA MARIE NOLLER  
3 Foley & Lardner  
4 321 N. Clark Street  
5 Suite 2800  
6 Chicago, IL 60654  
7 (312) 832-4363

8 MS. LUCILE H. COHEN  
9 Nelson, Mullins, Riley & Scarborough LLP  
10 1320 Main Street, 17th Floor  
11 Columbia, SC 29201  
12 (803) 799-2000  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 (Proceedings heard in open court:)

2 THE CLERK: 15 CV 6937, Nedza versus AIM Specialty  
3 Health.

4 THE COURT: Good morning. This is Judge Cox. Why  
5 don't you enter your appearances, starting with the plaintiff,  
6 please.

7 MR. WYSONG: Good morning, your Honor. Charlie  
8 Wysong with Hughes, Socol, Piers, Resnick & Dym for the  
9 relator.

10 THE COURT: Good morning.

11 MR. WYSONG: And I have with me Emily Brown and Matt  
12 Piers from my office, and Sam Brown with Phillips and Cohen,  
13 our co-counsel.

14 THE COURT: Good morning.

15 MR. PIERS: Good morning, your Honor.

16 MS. NOLLER: Good morning, Judge Cox. Lisa Noller  
17 and Lucy Cohen for the defendant, AIM Specialty Health.

18 THE COURT: Good morning to you as well.

19 All right. First of all, guys, thanks for -- I'm  
20 sorry about last Monday. There was a little mix-up in  
21 chambers, so I'm sorry we had to postpone until today.

22 I've read everything that you've filed on both the  
23 issues regarding the ESI protocol and the issue of the --  
24 essentially the temporal scope of discovery, and unless you  
25 guys have anything you want to say, I'm prepared to rule.

1 MR. WYSONG: We're happy to handle it however you  
2 like, your Honor, in terms of the relator. We can speak to  
3 the issues or the details, answer questions. We're happy to  
4 hear the Court's input.

5 THE COURT: Well, I will tell you that regarding the  
6 protocol, if we could take that up first.

7 I'm really reluctant to add any additional language  
8 to what is essentially a protocol that was developed here in  
9 the Seventh Circuit essentially to facilitate electronic  
10 discovery, and it seems to me that I think I agree with the  
11 defendant that your additions really go beyond what the --  
12 what is contemplated by both the discovery rules and our  
13 protocol.

14 And I also think that they're -- that these kinds of  
15 additional limitations can have the effect of creating more  
16 discovery disputes, not less. So I'm not inclined to change  
17 the protocol in the way that the plaintiff suggests.

18 However, I do not agree with the defendant that --  
19 that Rule 9(b) essentially should limit the scope of the  
20 discovery time period. I've reviewed the cases, and actually  
21 the cases that the defendant relies on that advance their  
22 argument are really out of district, and they're not very  
23 persuasive to me.

24 It seems to me that clearly, at least in our circuit,  
25 that limitation isn't really recognized, and I think that it's

1 not hard for me to see why the discovery time period from 2007  
2 or thereabouts, which is essentially when AIM was acquired,  
3 would be -- would be a good place to start.

4 On the other hand, I don't think we should really  
5 extend that time period post the date of the complaint. I  
6 mean, I just don't see why that necessarily would cull  
7 relevant information.

8 So that's where I'm inclined to fall on the disputes.

9 And I guess we'd probably use the first complaint  
10 date, which is August 7th of 2015, I think, as opposed to the  
11 third amended complaint, and it seems to me that eight years  
12 of discovery should be more than enough for the plaintiff to  
13 make its case or the case if that in fact -- if that case can  
14 be made.

15 So that's kind of where I come out on your discovery  
16 disputes, having read everything that you sent me and also the  
17 case law that you've cited.

18 MS. NOLLER: Your Honor, this is Lisa Noller.

19 Thank you for that, and not to argue with your ruling  
20 because you've been very clear. Obviously we agree  
21 August 7th, 2015 is an appropriate cutoff.

22 Regarding the prior period, I would like to make an  
23 argument for a more narrow period because in discovery that we  
24 have started so far, we have actually asked the relator to  
25 confirm the first date that the government was informed of the

1 claims, and they have refused to do that citing privilege over  
2 the date.

3 But if we had the date under *Cochise*, which is a  
4 recent Supreme Court case from last year, your Honor, we would  
5 know whether the period of time dating back to 2007 actually  
6 exceeds the statute of limitation for which they can cover  
7 damages, and so that might augur in favor of a 2012 date  
8 because the statute of limitations would be three years, not  
9 ten years --

10 THE COURT: Well --

11 MS. NOLLER: -- prior to filing of the date of the  
12 complaint.

13 THE COURT: Yeah, I mean, that's an excellent point  
14 except I'm not sure the statute of limitations necessarily  
15 would limit discovery prior to the period because discovery  
16 could still be relevant with respect to the alleged scheme,  
17 you know, so I don't -- I don't have -- I don't know -- I  
18 don't know anything about the dispute that you flagged, which  
19 is that they're not telling you the date. I don't have that  
20 in front of me, but I'm not -- I don't necessarily agree that  
21 the statute of limitations even would cut off the time period  
22 for discovery.

23 MS. NOLLER: Understood. Can you let us know then  
24 why the 2007 period is your elected start date just so it will  
25 help us inform custodians?

1           THE COURT: Because that's when AIM was acquired, and  
2 there might be information in that time period regarding how  
3 the acquiring company viewed AIM's business practices or  
4 whether there was some discussion about how those practices  
5 were set up, so that's basically where I come out on that.

6           MS. NOLLER: Okay. Even though Anthem is not a  
7 defendant.

8           THE COURT: Yes.

9           MS. NOLLER: Okay. Thank you, your Honor. That's  
10 helpful clarification.

11          THE COURT: But, again, I don't believe that there's  
12 any -- I don't believe there's any basis to extend the period  
13 beyond the date of the first complaint, which is August 7th,  
14 2015, and I don't believe any changes in the protocol are  
15 warranted.

16          MR. WYSONG: Your Honor, this is Charlie Wysong.  
17 Could we just briefly address the end date?

18          THE COURT: Sure, sure.

19          MR. WYSONG: Certainly -- the complaint was filed  
20 under seal and certainly, you know, that's not long after  
21 relator left, and so we do have up through near the current  
22 information that practices and what we say was fraud were  
23 ongoing. You know, we think, you know, there's no basis that  
24 AIM was notified of the complaint at the time it was filed due  
25 to the seal, and so, you know, we would suggest the more

1 appropriate cutoff date would be the unsealing of the  
2 complaint, your Honor.

3 THE COURT: I actually think eight years of discovery  
4 ought to be plenty here.

5 MR. WYSONG: Certainly, your Honor, with the  
6 understanding that we could --

7 THE COURT: I mean, you can revisit -- I mean, if you  
8 want to revisit this issue at a later point where you have a  
9 little bit more to go on, sure, we can look at it.

10 MR. WYSONG: Sure.

11 THE COURT: But like I said, I think eight years is  
12 plenty.

13 MR. WYSONG: Understood, your Honor, and we  
14 appreciate the -- we understand that, you know, as discovery  
15 proceeds, if we can make a showing or a basis to revisit the  
16 late -- the more recent years, approach that, certainly.

17 THE COURT: Anything further?  
18 What's your cutoff?

19 MS. NOLLER: Your Honor, it's next June, I believe.

20 THE COURT: Okay. June of 2021.

21 Do you happen to have the date?

22 MS. NOLLER: I can get it from the status report.

23 THE COURT: I think I can get it from the docket. I  
24 just -- the referral to me was this June, so it's not my  
25 cutoff. That's the only reason I'm asking.



1           So when did the parties think it would be appropriate  
2 to come back and check in?

3           MS. NOLLER: Charlie, what do you think, maybe  
4 60 days?

5           MR. WYSONG: Yeah, I think we are actively working on  
6 a number of discovery issues. I don't want to run it too  
7 long, but I think 60 days is appropriate for us to provide a  
8 meaningful update, and certainly if we're permitted to inquire  
9 if we think a sooner date would be helpful on particular  
10 issues, we can reach out to chambers if that's acceptable.

11          THE COURT: Sure. That's fine. You can always do  
12 that.

13          So 60 days from today's date would be what, Nakita?

14          THE DEFENDANT: That is the week of Christmas, so we  
15 can see them the week before.

16          THE COURT: Yeah.

17          THE CLERK: Wednesday, December 16th at 10:00.

18          THE COURT: Okay?

19          MS. NOLLER: And, your Honor, there's one additional  
20 item. There are two pro hac vice motions pending for our  
21 colleagues from Nelson Mullins that have not been ruled on.

22          THE COURT: Oh, sure, I'm happy to grant those.

23          MS. NOLLER: Thank you, your Honor.

24          MS. COHEN: Thank you, your Honor.

25          THE COURT: No problem.

1 THE CLERK: And, Judge, the discovery cutoff is  
2 June 14th, 2021.

3 THE COURT: Oh, thank you, Nakita.

4 So if you do -- if you do -- pardon me. If you do  
5 have any further -- if you have discovery disputes that you  
6 want me to address on the 16th, just make our chambers aware  
7 of it, and we'll tell you how to tee that up, okay?

8 MR. WYSONG: Yes, your Honor.

9 MS. NOLLER: Thank you, your Honor.

10 THE COURT: All right. Thanks, guys. Have a good  
11 day.

12 MS. COHEN: Thank you, your Honor.

13 MR. WYSONG: Take care.

14 MR. PIERS: Thank you, Judge.

15 (Which were all the proceedings heard.)

16 CERTIFICATE

17 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from  
18 the digital recording of proceedings in the above-entitled  
19 matter to the best of my ability, given the limitations of  
20 using a digital-recording system.

21 */s/Kathleen M. Fennell*

*November 13, 2020*

22 Kathleen M. Fennell  
23 Official Court Reporter

Date

24

25